DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 255 IR 052 592

TITLE	Academic Libraries. A Comprehensive Study of Academic Libraries in Oklahoma. Annual Report.
INSTITUTION	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Oklahoma City.
PUB DATE	Dec 87
NOTE	70p.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Libraries; *Annual Reports; Higher Education; Information Technology; Library Automation; Library Expenditures; *Library Materials; *Library Planning; *Library Services; Library Statistics; Library Surveys; Microcomputers; *Needs Assessment; Questionnaires

ABSTRACT

This report of the results of the 1987 survey of higher education libraries in Oklahoma begins by briefly describing the development and refinement of the annual survey instrument used to help determine the needs of these libraries. The data tables and analyses are then presented by type of institution, i.e., 2-year colleges, 4-year colleges, and comprehensive institutions. Comprehensive statistical data on the resources and activities of the state's academic libraries are presented in 16 tables, together with commentaries about and analyses of the data. The final chapter presents a summary of the findings, which indicate that all institutions do well in the provisions for library resources and services within their current constrained budgets, but that the need to embrace costly new information technologies and lack of adequate funding place Oklahoma students and faculty in a position of having less than the national standard level of library resources for their scholarly and research endeavors. Appendixes include a list of the members of the library study advisory committee; comments on the data analysis; and the survey form. (CGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302255

ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Comprehensive Study of Academic Libraries in Oklahoma

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Haber

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
State Capitol Complex, Oklahoma City

December 1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LR022542

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Avalon B. Reece
Chairman, Muskogee

J. D. Helms
Vice-Chairman, Oklahoma City

Joffa Kerr
Secretary, Oklahoma City

Joe F. Gary
Assistant Secretary, Durant

Bob F. Allee
Elk City

James E. Barnes
Tulsa

George B. Kaiser
Tulsa

Bert H. Mackie
Enid

Ernest Rodia
Lawton

Dan S. Hobbs
Interim Chancellor

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in compliance with Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Order 11246 as amended, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and other federal laws and regulations do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, handicap, or status as a veteran in any of their policies, practices, or procedures. This includes, but is not limited to, admissions, employment, financial aid, and educational services.

ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Annual Report on Academic Libraries in Oklahoma

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
State Capitol Complex, Oklahoma City
December 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements i

Executive Summary ii

Chapter I - Introduction 1

Chapter II - Two-Year Institutions 4

Chapter III - Four-Year Institutions 21

Chapter IV - Comprehensive Institutions 31

Chapter V - Summary 38

Appendix A - Library Study Advisory Committee 44

Appendix B - Data Analysis Comments. 45

Appendix C - Survey Form 47

TABLES

Two-Year Institutions

Table A — Activity Responsibility and Percentage of E&G Allocation - Fall 1985 7

Table B — Library Allocation per Student 9

Table C — Estimated Circulation (Library) Per Year 12

Table D — Learning Resources Center Use of Audio-video Equipment 15

Table E — Learning Resources Center Use of Learning Technology 18

Table F — Comparative Serial Holdings 19

Four-Year Institutions

Table G — Activity Responsibility and Percentage of E&G Allocation, Fall 1985 22

Table H — Library Allocation per Student 23

Table I — Estimated Circulation (Library) Per Year 24

Table J — Estimated Circulation Per Student Per Year (Fall 1985) 25

Comprehensive Institutions

Table K — Comprehensive Institutions Activity Responsibility and Percentage of E&G Allocation 32

Table L — Comprehensive Universities Library Allocation per Student 33

Table M — Comprehensive Universities Estimated Circulation (Library) Per Year 33

Table N — Comprehensive Universities Estimated Circulation Per Student Per Year (Fall 1985) 33

All Institutions

Table O — Library Expenditures for 1985-86 39

Table P — Library Collections for 1985-86 40

Acknowledgements

Individual members of the Library Study Advisory Committee provided assistance in conducting the "Annual Survey of Academic Libraries in Oklahoma" for fall 1985. A list of the members is presented in Appendix A.

Sul Lee, Dean of University Libraries, University of Oklahoma, took the lead in developing the section for comprehensive universities; Richard Madaus, Dean, Library and Learnaing Resources, Northeastern State University, for four-year institutions; and Mike Rusk, Dean, Library and Learning Resources, Tulsa Junior College, for two-year institutions. Richard Madaus and Mike Rusk are to be commended once again for processing and analyzing the data that evolved into the compilation of findings presented in this study.

Executive Summary

In May 1985, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education approved a publication entitled Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Study of Academic Libraries in Oklahoma. The purpose of that study was to determine the needs of higher education libraries in Oklahoma in these changing times and to make recommendations for improved efficiency, quality, service, and cooperation.

One of the recommendations of the study was that the State Regents should use the comprehensive library survey instrument developed for the study to gather comparable standardized library data annually from all state institutions. A major effort has been made to separate library resources centers that do not have audio-visual departments and services from those that do. It is felt that this study contains the kind of data needed by both state planners and college and university administrators.

This year's survey afforded the opportunity to refine the draft form of the annual survey instrument and provided a second year of comprehensive statistical data. Following this survey effort, a final minor adjustment of the survey instrument and analysis software is scheduled. Next year's survey will then be the first on the permanent annual survey instrument. As the data accumulate over the years, a comprehensive statistical picture of library resources and activities is possible. This collective database will provide valuable information for planning and evaluation of the academic information resources of the state.

This year's document is organized (after the general introductory chapter) by type of institution, i.e. two-year, four-year, and comprehensive.

S

In general, all institutions do very well in the provision for library resources and services within their current constrained budgets. However, the need to embrace costly newer information technologies combined with the failure to fund traditional library services at national standard levels continues to place Oklahoma students and faculty in a position of scholarship and research endeavors using less than national standard level library resources.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

The "Annual Report of Academic Libraries in Oklahoma" is the product of the Library Study Advisory Committee, originally convened in 1977, and reconvened in January 1984, to assist the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in identifying, gathering, and analyzing data, and providing expertise regarding academic libraries in Oklahoma.

In May 1985, the State Regents' office published "Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Study of Academic Libraries in Oklahoma." This document detailed a series of recommendations regarding current and future imperatives for academic library planning statewide and reported the results of the first survey of Oklahoma academic libraries in Chapter VIII, "Indices of Performance." This survey aided in fulfilling the following stated objectives of the May 1985 State Regents' Library Study:

> Compare Oklahoma's higher education libraries with national standards for like-type institutions.
>
> Identify the differences in library resources and services provided by Oklahoma's academic libraries.
>
> Compare Oklahoma's higher education libraries with like-type institutions of the ten-state region.

Though the 1984 survey satisfied the committee members' data needs at the time, it was the consensus of the advisory committee that much was missing from the survey in the way data were either not reported by participating libraries or were not kept, and for that reason could not be made part of the survey.

To fill certain gaps in the 1984 data as reported in the May 1985 study, and to provide for continuous awareness of academic library service levels and funding

needs, the Library Study Advisory Committee recommended that a survey of this nature become an annual event, based around a "sample week" set in the month of October and stored on standardized computer software, with the results made available to all interested parties.

Format

The data requested in the 1984 survey questionnaire have been carefully chosen to reflect seven basic parameters of academic library operations:

Part I	Library/Learning Resources Center Services and Population Served
Part II	Periodicals and Library/LRC Collections
Part III	Library/LRC Staff
Part IV	Loans, User Contacts and Hours of Service
Part V	Library/LRC Finances
Part VI	Special Questions
Part VII	Physical Facilities

Though many of the data elements requested in the various parts are optional, libraries are encouraged to make the effort to collect as much relevant data as possible to accurately reflect service levels and needs.

As this survey will become an annual event, there is a need to standardize the survey questionnaire and the computerized means of analyzing reported data to promote consistency in every aspect of the effort. In fall 1986, this "annual survey" will be repeated, using a standardized questionnaire document and recommending the second full week of October as the test week. It may very well become a biennial report after this year.

Analysis and tabulation of data will be on a LOTUS 1, 2, 3 spreadsheet, copies of which will be available in diskette form from the State Regents' office.

1986 Report Overview

In carrying out the survey, an effort was made to reach all two-year, four-year, and comprehensive institutions, both public and private, in Oklahoma. Institutions not returning data, or returning partial data provide the major flaw in the quality of

inferences which may be made from the tables printed in the succeeding chapters of this document.

This report is organized by type of institution with relevant data tables and summaries included to allow further analysis of the data. Summary fiscal tables are also available (O and P).

An effort has been made by the authors of each chapter to summarize and partially analyze each of the tables in hopes of guiding the readers in their own examination of the data and to pave the way for further analysis and inference.

In addition to the three primary tables, each chapter contains a subdivision entitled "Special Concerns" in which the author may expand upon certain facets of the data that apply only to certain types of institution or include extra tables extracted from the survey data that detail needs or concerns not included in the three primary tables listed above.

A document of this nature will be produced in the future on a yearly basis to continue reporting the results of the annual survey. Every five years, the survey data will be compared with national standards for academic libraries; with the first five-year study scheduled for 1991 using data from fall 1985 through fall 1990.

This comparison will allow conclusions to be drawn that show whether Oklahoma academic libraries and learning resources centers are progressing in the three primary comparison categories of facilities, staffing and collections.

The State Regents' Library Study Advisory Committee hopes that the data tabulated in this document contribute to outstanding library service for Oklahoma higher education. There is no progress without an awareness of the present, and the future is built upon the accurate planning of today.

CHAPTER II

Two-Year Community and Junior Colleges Learning Resources Programs

Data Tables and Analysis

Introduction

This chapter examines some of the data reported by two-year Junior and Community College Learning Resources Programs. The data represented in the six tables are open to a great deal of interpretation, as different institutions administer, budget, and house their learning resources centers in a variety of ways, reflecting the objectives of the institution itself and the scope of services offered by the individual LRC programs.

The Learning Resources Program, more than any other facet of an institution, expresses and implements the educational philosophy of the institution itself. Given the variety of services and administrative configurations that two-year LRC programs reflect, it is expected that the range of data collected into tables will be broad and, in some instances, could lend itself to misinterpretation if an assumed consistency in LRC programs among different institutions is not discouraged at the outset.

The purpose of this chapter is to compare and contrast data among and between institutions, and point out gaps in service levels that may require better, more consistent planning on the part of an institution's administration to improve and streamline its Learning Resources Program.

An effort was made in the survey questionnaire to separate LRC programs that do not include audio-visual departments and services from those that do. This factor, more than any other, tends to skew survey data, especially when reflecting

funding levels. Furthermore, the survey instrument asks the question: "In addition to centralized A-V services on campus, do individual, non-library departments have their own separate A-V budgets?" A YES answer to this question reflects the fact that though the LRC may have a wide range of A-V equipment and software, the institution sanctions alternative A-V services on campus and is committed to funding such services separately from the LRC.

Though 1985 was not a year in which a comparison of academic library data was made with national standards, an attempt was made to gather data that reflect usage of audio-visual equipment. Table 4 of the Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year Learning Resources Programs, (1979) provides a set of guidelines for equipment use, recommending that a certain amount of equipment of various types be available depending upon the number of uses of this equipment per year. Data from this survey may not be used for a direct comparison with the standards because although the usage for a certain type of equipment was collected, the number of pieces of equipment was not required by the survey. It is hoped this missing data will be collected in 1986, permitting a fuller use of Table 4 of the standards. Those data that were collected on A-V equipment usage are tabulated in Table D for the sake of comparison.

Table A - Activity, Responsibility and Percentage of E&G Allocation

This two-part table draws together financial data collected by the survey and is computed to show a total percentage of institutional E&G allocations committed to the operation of the Learning Resources Program. This percentage of E&G is further broken down into that portion for "library" services and that portion for "audio-visual" services.

Admitting that certain low percentages for total percentage of E&G could be the result of irregularities in the reported data, an average for Oklahoma seems to rest near the figure of 3.8, reflecting a serious need to adjust institutional allocations to approach even the lowest percentage recommended by the Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year Learning Resources Programs (1979).

> "Experience indicates. . . that a fully developed Learning Resources Program will usually require from 7 to 12 percent of the educational and general budget of the institution, whether these are separately identified as learning resources or diffused in a multiple number of accounts."

The second part of Table A, called "Activity Checks," is a compilation of categories checked as being part of the Learning Resources Program on the questionnaire. Such categories under "Library" include "Circulation of Printed Material," "Bibliographic Instruction," "Commercial Database Searching," and others. Under "Audio-Visual", such services as "Graphic Design," "Instructional Technology," and "Television Production" are included. Under "Special" the questionnaire requested a check if there were "Archives," "Special Collections," "Printshop," etc.

A total of seven checks is possible under "Library," seven are possible under "Audio-Visual," and thirteen are possible under "Special Services." Data from these areas are further reported in Tables D and E in this chapter.

TABLE A

ACTIVITY RESPONSIBILITY AND PERCENTAGE OF E&G ALLOCATION
FALL 1985

	Percentage of E&G			Activity Checks		
	Total (Current Reporting System)	Library	Aud Vis	Library	Aud Vis	Special
Two-Year Institutions - Public						
Carl Albert	3.5	3.5		4	3	2
Rogers State	4.5	4.3	.2	7		1
Connors	1.5	1.5		6	3	
Eastern Oklahoma State	2.3	1.7	.7	5	5	4
El Reno	3.2	2.0	.6	6	7	6
Murray	3.0	3.0		7	1	1
NEO	4.7	4.7		7	4	5
Northern Oklahoma	2.5	2.5	*	6	1	3
Okla. City Community	7.4	4.7	2.7	7	7	5
Rose State	5.2	3.0	2.1	7	7	4
Sayre	5.0	4.9	.1	4	2	1
Seminole	5.0	5.0	*	6	5	
Tulsa Junior College	5.4	3.9	1.6	6	7	5
Western Oklahoma	3.4	2.5	.9(1)	5	6	1
Two-Year Institutions - Private						
Oklahoma Missionary Baptist	.7	.7	*	6		
St. Gregory's	2.3	2.3	*	4		

* Audio-Visual responsibilities are budgeted, administered, and reported separately from library services and therefore fall outside this survey.

(1) Additional separate audio-visual budget exists.

Table B - Library Allocation per Student

In order to provide an adequate Learning Resources Program, the Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs (1981), call for the division of LRC activities into discreet, though in many cases mutually dependent, Learning Resources Units. These units may include such things as learning laboratories, libraries, audio-visual areas, graphic arts departments and technical processing areas.

Individual LRC "units" are often budgeted separately under the umbrella of the larger LRC program. The data gathered from the fall 1985 survey and tabulated on TABLE B - "Library Allocations per Student," do not provide for a breakdown of the institution's LRC program beyond the three categories "Library," "Audio-Visual" and "Special." In instances of institutions having audio-visual responsibilities spread campus wide and administered under a variety of programs an " * " has been inserted in the tables to show that all funds listed on the survey questionnaire are used for "Library" services with audio-visual services in the LRC program assuming too minor a role for comment.

TABLE B was computed using Line 1 of the questionnaire which reports institutional FTE. To compute the figure for column 1, "Total," Line 89 listing "Grand Total" of all Library/LRC Finances is divided by Line 1, FTE, to produce the figure reported. Columns for "Library," "Audio-Visual" and "Special" were computed using data from Line 88 for these three categories and dividing by Line 1, FTE.

The average allocation per FTE student on Library and A-V services in two-year institutions in Oklahoma is $119.54.

TABLE B

LIBRARY ALLOCATION PER FTE STUDENT
(In Dollars)

	Total	Library	Audio-Visual	Special
TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS - PUBLIC				
Carl Albert	$105.38	$105.38	$	$
Rogers State	92.22	87.13	5.09	
Connors	45.24	45.24		
Eastern Oklahoma State	74.21	53.27	20.94	
El Reno	97.89	61.99	17.51	18.39
Murray	110.28	110.28		
NEO	142.08	142.08		
Northern Oklahoma	78.37	78.37	*	
Okla. City Community	271.28	173.92	97.36	
Rose State	149.96	85.59	60.03	4.34
Sayre	105.56		103.23	2.33
Seminole	170.48	170.48		
Tulsa Junior College	169.78	120.76	49.02	
Western Oklahoma	110.76	80.51	29.82(1)	0.44
TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS - PRIVATE				
Oklahoma Missionary Baptist	15.23	15.23	*	
St. Gregory's	132.64	132.64	*	

* Audio-Visual responsibilities are budgeted, administered, and reported separately from library services and therefore fall outside this survey.

(1) Additional separate A-V budget(s) exist within the institution.

Table C - Estimated Circulation (Library) Per Year

Table C reports the estimated circulation of library materials for the academic year July 1984 to June 1985. The survey instrument was amended for 1985 by adding a section that requested book circulation, broken down by month, for the entire twelve-month period.

In addition to these "hard" circulation figures, data were gathered from a test week held November 18-24, 1985, in which librarians were asked to keep specific usage data on materials that circulated outside the library as well as "in-house use," those items that could be identified as having been used in the library.

The test week was selected to fit the timetable of the survey as well as to be representative of a sample week of service during the academic year. For the 1987 survey, a test week constituting the second full week in October, 1986, is recommended as being more representative of library/LRC circulation. For a complete description of the formula used to compute annual circulation from the data reported from the sample week, see the description of this table from Data Analysis Comments, Appendix B.

Special Concerns

The rate of change, especially in the areas of educational technology and instructional design, has caused the role of the Learning Resources Program in two-year community and junior colleges to be subject to continuous revision as new services, often brought by new technology, come into being.

The Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs (Revised), 1981, outline an explicit four-fold purpose for LRC programs as follows:

a. To provide leadership and assistance in the development of instructional systems which employ effective and efficient means of accomplishing institutional objectives.

b. To provide an organized and readily accessible collection of materials and supportive equipment needed to meet institutional, instructional, and individual needs of students and faculty.

c. To provide a staff qualified, concerned, and involved in serving the needs of students, faculty, and community.

d. To encourage innovation, learning, and community services by providing facilities and resources which will make them possible.

The general message of the purposes listed is quite clear. Two-year LRC programs are to provide a staff and faculty trained in the use of more than one type of learning resource. The administration of the LRC is to promote a synthesis of resources in offering to students and faculty a program that not only includes A-V services but seeks out and exploits innovative equipment and materials to provide a technological mix in the learning environment.

The two special tables included in the succeeding pages are an attempt to extract information from the survey data that reflects the current usage of A-V equipment (Table D) and Learning Technology (Table E) in two-year institutions in Oklahoma.

TABLE C

ESTIMATED CIRCULATION (LIBRARY) PER YEAR

	Total	Per Student
TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS - PUBLIC		
Carl Albert	14,447	14.2
Rogers State	**	**
Connors	19,235	17.3
Eastern Oklahoma State	**	**
El Reno Jr. College	**	**
Murray State College	20,641	24.9
NEO	158,723	69.1
Northern Okla. College	**	**
Okla. City Community	94,926	31.6
Rose State		
Sayre		
Seminole	24,871	27.1
Tulsa Junior College	**	**
Western Oklahoma	**	**
TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS - PRIVATE		
Oklahoma Missionary Baptist	2,586	38.6
St. Gregory's		

** Data provided fell outside sample validity parameters. (See page 43.)

Table D - Learning Resources Center Use of A-V Equipment

This table is a depiction of A-V services based on the usage of six types of multimedia hardware common to most Learning Resources Programs. The intent of the survey questionnaire in requesting these data was to compare and contrast usage of A-V equipment in the LRC, seeking not only to point out certain trends, but also to obtain a picture of the level of commitment to A-V services in two-year institutions statewide.

It is in the area of audio-visual services that a flaw occurs in the reporting of usage data that could result in misrepresentation of the extent of an institution's commitment to innovative learning technologies if one fact is not realized when evaluating the table. In four instances, librarians reported that A-V services were budgeted separately from the LRC, implying that a clear distinction is drawn between library, book-oriented services and multimedia services. A case can be made that the data in Table D are only a partial picture of an institution's commitment to A-V services, and that equipment and staff for carrying out these services are in existence in instructional divisions, learning labs and other, non-LRC areas that have purchased their own hardware and software to fulfill a narrower set of objectives.

On initial examination of Table D, some trends are immediately apparent. There appears to be a shift away from the use of 16mm film and toward the use of videotape for delivery of continuous visual instruction. The relatively high usage of videocassette units in two-year institutions may represent a corresponding development of videocassette collections statewide. In every instance except two, videocassette usage outweighed 16mm usage. The average annual usage of videocassette units is 4,300, as opposed to 277 for 16mm projectors. This may be influenced by the increased use of video telecourses for higher learning.

Another trend appears to be away from record players and toward phono-disk collections and audio-cassettes. In two instances, usage of record players was equal to usage of audio-cassette players, but in each other instance audio-cassette units appear the most heavily used -- in one case by a ratio of 22 to 1.

TABLE D

LEARNING RESOURCES CENTER USE OF AUDIO-VIDEO EQUIPMENT

	16mm	Super 8	Video Cassette	Slide Proj.	Audio Cassette	Record Players
TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS - PUBLIC						
El Reno	78	0	347	178	203	134
Murray	50	0	1500	1000	200	200
Seminole *	156	0	104	572	780	50
Tulsa Junior College	725	0	14883 **	996	1338	175
Carl Albert	200	0	400	160	40	40
Connors	445	75	0	150	750	50
Eastern Oklahoma State	423	444	720	730	1203	192
NEO	819	0	3413	1531	2767	
Okla. City Community	235	0	9176	3185	4960	216
Rose State	130	0	19521	138	109	33
Northern Oklahoma *	0	0	1335	6	63	11
Western Oklahoma *	60	5	200	175	90	15
TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS - PRIVATE						
Oklahoma Missionary Baptist *	No Data					
St. Gregory's	No Data					

* Centralized A-V services not in LRC budget.
** Data represent usage of three campus Learning Resources Centers.

Table E Learning Resources Center Use of Learning Technology

The compilation of data in Table E represents information gathered by the survey that reflects the direction LRC programs in two-year institutions are going in the implementation of technology, specifically computer and telecommunications technology, in their individual programs. As was the case with audio-visual services, the instructional systems represented by Table E may be representative of a larger effort by an institution to make use of computer and telecommunications technology, an effort in which the LRC program plays a part but shares -- and in some instances, competes -- with other instructional areas having their own hardware and software. This case may be especially true in the areas of Learning Laboratories and Microcomputer Software holdings and must be kept in mind when evaluating the information in the table.

Learning Technology is a term that has come to represent a wide range of equipment that could include hardware shown in the previous table under the general heading Audio-Visual. In Table E, "Learning Technology" is used to imply the inclusion of computer technology in the LRC program. More and more it will become evident that the microcomputer is the essential element in the technological mix of the Learning Resources Center. Innovation by LRC administration in the purchase and use of micro and mainframe computing capabilities in two-year programs is the crucial boundary now being crossed by community and junior colleges in Oklahoma.

Special mention is necessary of the data included under the heading "Automated Processing Costs (Annual)." Only four institutions reported cost figures in this area. Obviously these are not the only four institutions with automated functions in their program, but in many instances these costs will be included under other budgetary units within the institution. Automated library activities such as

circulation systems, on-line catalog, or media scheduling are not generally considered to be "learning technologies"; however, for the purposes of this report, the presence of these systems in the LRC environment does show a commitment on the part of the institution to automate LRC operations with the objective of streamlining services that result in learning.

The category, "Learning Laboratories," was not well defined by the 1985 survey. These Learning Resources Units may include microcomputers, as in the case of CAI (Computer Assisted Instruction) labs, or they may not, as in the case of language laboratories or other audio-visual-based instructional areas. Clearly the microcomputer is showing its potential in all areas of LRC service, and the inference may be made that though a learning lab may at present not include a micro for student use, the imperative exists for its inclusion in the near future. The 1986 survey instrument will be amended to reflect this trend more specifically.

In general, it appears from the table that LRC programs in Oklahoma are beginning to integrate new technology into their services. Five institutions indicated small but growing collections of microcomputer software. It will be of interest to note in future surveys what hardware these collections support (Apple, Commodore, IBM-PC, etc.), and what brand of microcomputer appears to be dominant in Oklahoma learning resources centers.

Clearly there is ample room for refinement of Table E in future surveys and reports of this nature. Its inclusion is only an initial look at the commitment that two-year institutions are making in "leading edge" technology statewide. Future surveys will allow comparisons with this report in hopes of noting growth in this vital facet of the Learning Resources Program.

TABLE E

LEARNING RESOURCES CENTER USE OF LEARNING TECHNOLOGY

	Commercial Data Base Searching	Learning Laboratories	Microcomputer Software (holdings)	Automated Processing Costs (Annual)	Satellite Communications
Carl Albert			0	0	
Rogers State			0	2,000	
Connors			0	0	
Eastern OK State		*	13	0	
El Reno		*	52	600	
Murray	*	*	154	0	
NEO	*	*	10	0	
Northern OK			0	0	
OKCCC	*		0	16,600	*
Rose State	*		0	19,700	*
Sayre		*	0	0	
Seminole			0	0	
Tulsa Jr. Coll.	*	*	34	2,386	
Western OK			0	0	
OK Missionary Baptist			0	0	
St. Gregory's			0	0	

NOTE: Asterisk represents the presence of the service indicated in the institution's LRC program.

Table F - Comparative Serial Holdings

The following table is a comparison of serial subscription holdings in the two-year public institutions statewide. The Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year Learning Resources Programs (1979) provides for minimum and good levels of periodical subscription holdings based on FTE student enrollment. For the purposes of this report, the amount of FTE above the minimum level in a certain category was converted to a percentage which was then used to compute the percentage on a continuum between minimum and good figures for subscription holdings. The resulting percentage of achievement of national standards should be a more realistic figure than if the minimum or good (i.e. low or high) level for holdings was taken directly from Table 2 of the standards.

TABLE F

COMPARATIVE SERIAL HOLDINGS

School	Subscriptions Needed	Current Subscriptions	Percent Achievement
Carl Albert	301	240	80 %
Rogers State	396	422	107
Connors	301	280	93
Eastern Okla. State	338	169	50
El Reno	200	179	90
Murray	200	261	130
NEO	430	343	80
Northern Oklahoma	302	230	76
Okla. City Community	500	406	81
Rose State	700	555	79
Seminole	200	253	126
Tulsa Jr. College	760	515	68
Western Oklahoma	300	191	64

While it is encouraging to see that two institutions are in excess of the levels included in national standards, it must be borne in mind that standards are guidelines only and do not reflect local requirements. The state average for achievement level of periodical holdings is 86%. More attention must be given to subscriptions in Oklahoma community and junior colleges before the percentage slips even lower, making it impossible to recover.

CHAPTER III

FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Introduction

This chapter explores the data of the four-year institutions, both public and private. There is a wide diversity in size of institution, ranging from Hillsdale and Flaming Rainbow with 124 and 170 FTE students, to Northeastern State and Central State with 6,051 and 8,604. However, as with the other chapters of this document, tabular reporting is based on a per-student percentage of the total in order to represent more accurately the institutional commitment for the provision and student utilization of library resources and services.

Data Tables

The tables included are the following:

Table G	Activity Responsibility and Percentage of E&G Allocation
Table H	Library Allocation Per Student
Table I	Estimated Circulation (Library) Per Year
Table J	Estimated Circulation Per Student Per Year (From Sample Week)

TABLE G

ACTIVITY RESPONSIBILITY AND PERCENTAGE OF E&G ALLOCATION
FALL 1985

	Percentage of E&G				Activity Checks		
	TOTAL (Current Regents Reporting System	Library	Audio Visual	Special	Library	Audio Visual	Special
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS (PUBLIC)							
Cameron	5.0	5.0	*		6		1
Central State	4.6	4.6	*		7		3
East Central	5.4	4.7	.7		7	4	2
Langston	2.6	2.1		.5	5		2
Northeastern	6.2	5.0	.7	.4	7	7	7
Northwestern	5.5	4.9	.6		6	7	
Panhandle State	5.1	5.1			5	2	
Southeastern	4.6	2.8	.8	1.0	7	7	5
Southwestern	5.1	5.1	*		5		
USAO	4.5	4.5	*		6		
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS (PRIVATE)							
Bartlesville Wesleyan	1.2	1.1	.1		5	1	2
Bethany Nazarene	5.5	3.5	1.3	.2	7	6	2
Flaming Rainbow	.8	.8	*		3		
Hillsdale	3.8	3.8			5	2	2
Oklahoma Christian			*		6	6	8
Okla. City University	1.7	1.7	*		5		
Oral Roberts			*		6		2
Phillips University	3.8	3.4	.3		7	4	2

* Audio-Visual responsibilities are budgeted, administered, and reported separately from library services and therefore fall outside this survey.

TABLE H

LIBRARY ALLOCATION PER STUDENT

	Total	Library	Audio-Visual	Special
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS (PUBLIC)				
Cameron	$178.45	$178.45	$ *	$
Central State	155.59	155.59	*	
East Central	181.00	157.14	23.86	
Langston	77.83	63.30		14.53
Northeastern	186.98	151.41	22.33	13.24
Northwestern	185.76	167.18	18.58	
Panhandle State	227.60	227.60		
Southeastern	178.50	108.71	29.79	40.00
Southwestern	174.99	174.99	*	
USAO	229.77	229.77	*	
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS (PRIVATE)				
Bartlesville Wesleyan	97.66	89.25	8.41	
Bethany Nazarene	293.11	204.11	76.99	12.01
Flaming Rainbow	45.87	45.87	*	
Hillsdale	190.16	190.16		
Okla. Christian	165.61	115.71	49.90	
Okla. City University	120.45	120.45	*	
Oral Roberts			*	
Phillips	354.84	325.17	29.67	

* Audio-Visual responsibilities are budgeted, administered, and reported separately from library services and therefore fall outside this survey.

TABLE I

ESTIMATED CIRCULATION (LIBRARY) PER YEAR

	Total	Per Student
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS (PUBLIC)		
Cameron	115,594	32.2
Central State	488,970	56.3
East Central	71,132	20.6
Langston	**	**
Northeastern	317,640	52.5
Northwestern	69,574	44.9
Panhandle State	**	**
Southeastern	84,147	27.3
Southwestern	179,918	41.2
USAO	95,538	110.4
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS (PRIVATE)		
Bartlesville Wesleyan	19,830	55.9
Bethany Nazarene	62,351	64.3
Flaming Rainboiw		
Hillsdale	**	**
Okla. Christian	**	**
Okla. City University	61,516	33.6
Oral Roberts		
Phillips	53,082	68.2

** Data provided fell outside sample validity parameters. (See page 43.)

TABLE J

ESTIMATED CIRCULATION PER STUDENT PER YEAR
(FROM SAMPLE WEEK)
FALL 1985

	Circ/ Stu Library	Turn-stile Count	Circ/ Stu A-V	A-V User Count	Circ/ Stu Special	Special User Count
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS (PUBLIC)						
Cameron	32.2	48.0	*	*		
Central State	56.3	42.6	*	*		
East Central	20.6	*				
Langston	**	**				
Northeastern	52.5	69.9	.7	58.4	2.5	.4
Northwestern	44.9	*	.8	.6		
Panhandle State	**	**				
Southeastern	27.3	51.7				
Southwestern	41.2	39.5	*	*		
USAO	110.4	56.2	*	*		
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS (PRIVATE)						
Bartlesville Wesleyan	55.9					
Bethany Nazarene	64.3		2.6	18.5	4.5	4.5
Flaming Rainbow		3.2				
Hillsdale	**	**				
Okla. Christian	**	**				
Okla. City University	33.6	48.5				
Oral Roberts						
Phillips	68.2	121.6	1.3			

** Data provided fell outside sample validity parameters. (See page 43.)

C. Comments on the Tables

Two methods of evaluating and comparing library allocations are presented in Tables G and H. Table G shows library allocation as a percentage of each institution's Education and General budget. Table H shows library allocations in dollars per student for each institution.

There are no absolutes in measuring the adequacy of a library's financial support, since the amount of money needed depends on the goals of a particular institution and the quantity and quality of library/information services required to support these goals. Over the years, a number of formulas have been developed to measure the adequacy of the library budget. The most commonly used formula is a simple one which presents the library budget as a percentage of the institution's E&G budget. This is the method used by the Association of College and Research Libraries/American Library Association Standards For College Libraries.

Table G shows the percentage of each institution's E&G budget designated for total library services during 1985-86. That percentage is then broken down among the three areas of service: library services, audio-visual services, and special services. Again, because of the varying nature of missions, goals, and objectives, some institutions offer a variety of resources and services, while others offer a selected subset of possible resources and services. Further, some institutions offer services listed in the "Audio-visual" and "Special Services" categories of their surveys, outside the library, under separate administrative and budgetary designs. This situation is noted by an asterisk in the tables and obviously complicates comparative listings concerning library services and budgets.

The national standards document of The Association of College and Research Libraries/American Library Association (the source of standards used by North Central and the National Commission for the Accreditation of Teacher Education in the accreditation process) notes:

> Standard 8.1 The library's appropriation shall be six percent of the total institutional budget for educational and general purposes.
>
> Commentary: The degree to which the college is able to fund the library in accord with institutional objectives is reflected in the relationship of the library appropriation to the total educational and general budget of the college. It is recommended that library budgets, exclusive of capital costs and the cost of physical maintenance, not fall below six percent of the college's total educational and general expenditures if it is to sustain the range of library programs required by the institution and meet appropriate institutional objectives and appropriate accreditation. This percentage should be greater if the library is attempting to overcome past deficiencies, or to meet the needs of new academic programs.

Audio-visual and/or microcomputer activities in the library (listed in the survey under "A-V" and "Special Services") must be funded over and above the six percent minimum for the services covered under "Library" in the survey. This is noted as follows in the ACRL Standards:

> Standard 8.1.1 The library's appropriation shall be augmented above the six percent level depending upon the extent to which it bears responsibility for acquiring, processing, and servicing audio-visual materials and microcomputer resources.
>
> Commentary: It is difficult for an academic library that has not traditionally been purchasing microcomputer and audio-visual materials to accommodate such purchases without some budgetary increase. The level of expenditure depends upon whether or not the institution has an audio-visual center separate from the library that acquires and maintains both audio-visual materials and hardware as well as a computer center that absorbs all costs related to microcomputer resources, even those included in the library.

These points have been reinforced by the State Regents' policy position that six percent of E&G is considered minimal for library services in Oklahoma higher education. Clearly this minimum is not being met. Table G also compares the number of professional activities offered by each library with the percentage of the E&G budget. In general, libraries with a wide range of services will need larger budgets than the six percent minimum.

Tables I and J present the estimated circulation of library materials for the 1985-86 academic year. The estimates are derived from a sample week in November 1985, when reporting libraries attempted to count all materials used, both inside the library as well as those charged for outside use. Table I shows the total library circulation and the library circulation per student for each institution. This should provide a frame of reference as one views the tables in per student fashion (i.e., one volume per student represents a very different total amount of material in a 20,000-student institution than in a 1,000-student institution). Table J shows the number of items circulated per student, along with the number of patrons entering the building by turnstile count. It further explores the usage of extended services in the audio-visual and special services areas for those institutions that offer these under library supervision.

D. Special Concerns

The maintenance and development of library collections is an ongoing and continual process. As information and knowledge continue to grow, the capacity of Oklahoma institutions (even when viewed as a single statewide resource) to capture significant and relevant portions of the information available is critical to both the basic process of higher education and the specialized needs of a high-technology research program. A broad range of library-based information is, by definition, a significant element in aspects of economic development, as well as in education. Decision-making is only as good as the information upon which the decisions are based.

The national standards recognize the six percent requirement noted in Section C for library/institutional fiscal relationships. Further, this six percent should enable the purchase of sufficient printed resources as noted by the following passage from the same standards:

> Since a library book collection once developed, and then allowed to languish, loses its utility very rapidly, continuity of collection development is essential. Experience has shown that even after collections have attained sizes required by this Standard, they can seldom retain their requisite utility without sustaining annual gross growth rates, before withdrawals, of at least five percent.

The failure of the institutions to achieve a minimal six percent of E&G level of library funding may very well have critically damaged the quality of education possible because of a limited learning resource environment. Using the above five percent per year growth rate as a comparative standard, the following data were drawn from this year's survey:

School	Volumes Needed Per Year	Actual Last Year	Percent Achievement
Cameron	8,583	5,961	69%
Central	23,192	2,515	10%
East Central	9,713	5,575	57%
Northeastern	16,609	7,706	46%
Northwestern	5,412	3,722	68%
Southeastern	10,228	3,473	33%
Southwestern	18,576	6,341	34%

Clearly, Oklahoma is not building a rich statewide resource of library resources to support the process of higher education.

Again, the failure of adequate funding clearly manifests itself. Compounding the problem is the poor showing on staffing noted in the Personnel Standards in the 1985 comprehensive study.

Obviously, it is not beneficial to dwell in the mire of poor performance on national standards. The poor fiscal health of Oklahoma higher education is a matter of record. The special concern expressed here is that through bad times, as well as good times, the library resources and services of higher education should be recognized at a minimum fixed-cost level of six percent of E&G. This is critical in times of restrictive funding, and is likewise minimal in a robust fiscal environment. According to two years of survey data, the six percent level is not being attained as

a statewide minimum in good times or bad times, and this is limiting a vital statewide information resource which has profound effects on the long-term educational development of the state as well as economic development implications.

This problem can only be repaired through continual long-term attention. Quick fixes are not possible even in high-revenue times, since current publishing practice is very short term in nature. Library materials not purchased within six months of publication are primarily out of print and unavailable. Because materials were not purchased within the last two years, students of the 1990's will lack the capacity to learn from materials produced in the 1980's. It is the responsibility of the institution to acquire and guarantee access to the knowledge and information of the years, and Oklahoma students are not going to have the resource base of other states whose institutions have achieved and maintained a higher percentage of the national standard.

CHAPTER IV

Comprehensive Institutions

Introduction

For the purposes of this study, a comprehensive university is described as one that offers degree programs in a broad spectrum of fields, has a Ph.D. program, a variety of professional schools granting graduate degrees, accepts research grants and contracts, and has a library of at least half a million volumes. Three institutions of higher learning in the state of Oklahoma qualify under these requirements: the University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University and the University of Tulsa. Each maintains a library of substantial size and quality with ongoing support of unquestioned commitment.

It would not be reasonable to attempt to arrive at an "average" or "median" in any category of figures describing the libraries of the three comprehensive universities in Oklahoma; two of them are quite similar in purpose, support, and size, while the third is set apart by distinct differences. Statistics from the libraries of the institutions will be used, therefore, to establish parameters for assimilating data by which their respective sizes, services, budgets, and other characteristics can be seen separately or in comparison with similar institutions.

A research library is not simply a larger college library. The library of a comprehensive university will provide a broad and in-depth collection of materials to clientele involved in graduate programs of study and to faculty conducting research, much of which may be funded through grants and contracts. The cost of these materials and services are far and away above those of the average college library, even the university that offers few graduate degrees, and certainly those that offer no doctoral programs. It has been said that the library costs of a graduate program are at least ten times that of the same program at the baccalaureate level, and it

certainly will be more than that if major research, particularly contractual research, is conducted in the field.

TABLE K
COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES
ACTIVITY RESPONSIBILITY AND PERCENTAGE OF E&G ALLOCATION
FALL 1985

	Percentage of E&G				Activity Checks		
	TOTAL (Current Regents Reporting System)	Library	A-V	Special	Library	A-V	Special
Univ. of Okla.	4.6		*		7		3
Okla. State Univ.	6.0		*	.01	7		3
Univ. of Tulsa	6.8	6.2		.6	7	3	3

* Audio-visual responsibilities are budgeted, administered, and reported separately from library services and therefore fall outside this survey.

TABLE L
COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES
LIBRARY ALLOCATION PER STUDENT

	Total	Library	Audio-Visual	Special
Univ. of Okla.	$249.67	$	$ *	$
Okla. State Univ.	290.55	287.64	*	2.9
Univ. of Tulsa	646.21	590.20		56.01

TABLE M
COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES
ESTIMATED CIRCULATION (LIBRARY) PER YEAR

	Total	Per Student
Univ. of Okla.	**	**
Okla. State Univ.	890,538	48.2
Univ. of Tulsa	269,283	60.7

TABLE N
COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITIES
PART II

ESTIMATED CIRCULATION PER STUDENT PER YEAR
(FROM SAMPLE WEEK)
FALL 1985

	Circ/ Stu Library	Turn-stile Count	Circ/ Stu A-V	A-V User Count	Circ/ Stu Special	Special User Count
Univ. of Okla.	**	68.5	*	*		
Okla. State Univ.	48.2	**	*	*	29.7	
Univ. of Tulsa	60.7	113.3			.7	

* Audio-visual responsibilities are budgeted, administered, and reported separately from library services and therefore fall outside this survey.

** Data provided fell outside sample validity parameters. (See page 43.)

Comments on Tables

In the indicators of percentage of E&G budget and library allocations per student, attention must first be called to the fact that special funding beyond the library's operating budget is reflected in these data. This is an important consideration because of the environment in which Oklahoma's academic libraries -- including those of its comprehensive universities -- are operating today. It is one in which special funding is frequently present to move forward with major automation projects. Thus, the normal "bread and butter" operating budgets may be lower than the reported figures indicate.

The same perspective applies to library allocations per student, where special funding may skew figures. Looking for a pattern over several years of reported figures will provide a more reliable and accurate understanding of the percentage of E&G budgets and allocation per student institutions provide their libraries.

Estimated circulation per year and estimated circulation per student, while linked to funding, are measurements of a different nature, reflecting a sector, a portion, or recorded uses of library resources. Historically, libraries have measured only that portion of the collection circulated outside the libraries.

In the matter of comparison between the two larger institutions, it can be assumed that some general parity between OU and OSU is present in this category. TU's lower figures reflect a smaller user body and smaller collection.

By the same token, the estimated circulation per student per year table can be interpreted to assume a rough parity between the larger institutions. While OU's data were not available for this year, 53.3 was reported last year. The higher figure of TU should, in part, be credited to a new humanities-based core curriculum that requires intensive use of library resources by undergraduates.

Special Concerns

As suggested above, the selected statistics contained in this report reveal only a few of the many activities carried on within a research library. The broad and complex constituency of users range from undergraduates completing requirements for baccalaureate degrees, students in professional and graduate study programs, and faculty operating in a variety of teaching and research activities. While it may resemble a college library in its service to undergraduate students, it also provides library support through special operations and services to professional schools and research programs. It also serves a diverse faculty whose interests range broadly through scores of intellectual disciplines. Services such as reference, interlibrary loan, access to national databases, and library instruction must be geared to meet various user levels, from undergraduates to internationally recognized scholars. The costs of providing such services are significant, and shortfalls of funding to support these services threaten the entire range of programs offered by the university.

There is increasing use of automated technology in the research libraries. Most of the state's academic libraries are rapidly moving toward more extensive automated applications. The research libraries face special challenges -- because of their size and complexity -- in making use of the new technologies. All three library systems have already made massive commitments to automation, and have made considerable gains. It must be stressed, however, that the integrated systems, creating on-line environments for users, are still largely in planning and implementation stages, not fully operational. When this has been accomplished by the three comprehensive university libraries, they will be in a position to share database information among themselves and with other institutions in the state that

might have on-line systems operational. The capability of the enhanced telecommunications system to provide these linkages is being viewed with considerable interest and anticipation.

While the research libraries have made a major commitment to automation, their efforts are tempered with an understanding that the desired benefits of the new technology are not likely to radically alter many of the operations and services found in today's research library. Library futurists see the application augmenting and facilitating services greatly. Technology is not a panacea, however, that offers to radically change commitments made to collection development and service operations. Gutenberg is alive and well, and collections of printed materials still must be acquired, processed, housed, and serviced; staffs still must be recruited, trained, and provided opportunities for continuing professional development; and of great importance, patrons must be taught to effectively use the new automated tools provided by libraries.

Resource sharing locally and nationally in the next decade is required. For the past twenty years, the growth of library databases has been characterized by the growth of national, centralized, mainframe-based systems. It is difficult to overstate their value to the library community, particularly research libraries. On-line Computer Library Center is the largest system to emerge, with several others present as well. The advent of the microcomputer as well as the development of independent, stand-alone systems capable of economically storing or accessing large databases locally is beginning to radically change this pattern. The dependence of libraries on those national database vendors is fragmenting, and the era of distributed databases is dawning. Its impact on resource-sharing is early in its development, but it can bode well for Oklahoma academic libraries, as well as other

libraries in the state. The good will and cooperative spirit existing in the state's library community, coupled with the possibilities of linking systems provided from the central coordinating agency in higher education, could provide an opportunity for the state to lead nationally, rather than to follow.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY

General Comments

To be effective, scholarship and research logically require quality information resources. The basic information resource called upon by faculty and students in higher education is the library. To be effective, a modern library in today's "information age" requires consistent and a higher percentage of funding than the academic library of the recent past.

Marvels of newer technology offer a broad range of exciting services. However, there are significant start-up and maintenance costs in any new technological environment. In Oklahoma, major efforts are being made by academic libraries to embrace the newer technology. Yet, funding for academic libraries has not been sufficient to provide even the complete level of traditional print resources required to achieve minimum national standards. Table O presents institutional data concerning library expenditures for 1985-86, not only as traditionally reported funds from E&G Part I, but from E&G Part II and Section 13 and New College Funds. Table P contains institutional data concerning library collections for 1985-86; number of books, microforms, government documents and combined audio-visual materials. After two years of comprehensive survey data, it continues to appear that sufficient institutional percentage budgetary commitment is not being made to academic libraries statewide in bad economic times. Neither was it made during the recent economic growth period.

Two-Year Institutions

By their nature, two-year institutions tend to embrace newer technologies and learning systems before the four-year and comprehensive institutions. Because of their smaller size, change can be effected at a faster rate than the inertia-bound collections of larger and more research-oriented institutions.

LIBRARY EXPENDITURES FOR 1985-86

Institution	E&G Part I	E&G Part II	Section 13 & New College Funds *	Total	E&G Part I Expenditures All Functions	% of E&G Expenditures for Library
Universities						
OU	$4,062,424	$101,206	$200,000	$4,363,630	$90,418,658	4.8
OSU	4,699,456	1,473	-0-	4,670,929	89,654,586	5.2
Senior Colleges						
CSU	1,311,628	48,307	-0-	1,359,935	29,322,559	4.6
ECU	613,559	25,448	15,000	654,007	11,132,278	5.9
NESU	1,123,577	61,662	63,070	1,248,309	18,923,520	6.6
NWOSU	217,527	8,432	35,000	260,959	5,173,126	5.0
SEOSU	513,869	50,977	-0-	564,846	12,057,875	4.7
SWOSU	567,431	-0-	-0-	567,431	14,337,296	4.0
Cameron	576,038	99,429	-0-	675,467	12,280,454	5.5
Langston	205,103	5,323	54,800	265,226	6,061,594	4.4
Panhandle	185,353	1,951	-0-	187,304	4,463,687	4.2
USAO	187,960	22,168	-0-	210,128	4,262,413	4.9
Two-Year Colleges						
CAJC	85,273	-0-	-0-	85,273	3,023,475	2.8
Connors	98,175	5,000	-0-	103,175	3,170,373	3.3
Eastern	210,000	-0-	-0-	210,000	4,276,395	4.9
El Reno	75,565	-0-	-0-	75,565	2,356,415	3.2
Murray	81,991	14,015	-0-	96,006	2,990,171	3.2
NEOAMC	319,525	8,971	-0-	328,496	6,574,133	5.0
NOC	103,330	1,447	-0-	104,777	3,316,209	3.2
OCCC	734,354	-0-	-0-	734,354	11,056,988	6.6
Rogers	167,937	2,072	-0-	170,009	4,959,800	3.4
Rose	729,524	-0-	-0-	729,524	14,155,710	5.2
Seminole	110,531	-0-	-0-	110,531	2,933,580	3.8
TJC	1,145,374	6,591	-0-	1,151,965	24,827,788	4.6
WOSC	156,818	-0-	-0-	156,818	3,127,898	5.0
Sayre	27,476	-0-	-0-	27,476	604,613	4.5

* Specific Allocations for Library

November 24, 1986

TABLE P

COMPARATIVE COLLECTION SIZES FOR TWO- AND FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS BASED ON 1985 SURVEY DATA

	Number of Books	Number of Microforms	Government Documents	Combined A-V
Four-Year Institutions - Public				
Cameron	186871	191799	0	4254
Central State	176372	426137	152500	7503
East Central	221479	717429	0	2816
Langston	99672	1803	1033	671
NSU	208231	290554	266552	4015
NWOSU	124632	318361	111328	2109
OCOMS	19540	19194	0	1898
OU	1940156	2400628	1466840	7072
OUHSC	174681	650	0	1521
OU Tulsa Med.	23570	0	0	0
OSU	1398221	1649923	0	764
OSU Tech - OKC	15778	1158	0	327
OSU Tech - OKM	101435	637	0	267
Panhandle State	81946	6918	0	3915
SEOSU	146920	116145	56412	1339
SWOSU	223110	391154	27176	0
USAO	75656	3680	0	2573
Four-Year Institutions - Private				
Bacone	0	0	0	0
Bartlesville Wesleyan	61235	54156	0	1099
Flaming Rainbow	4068	31050	0	0
Hillsdale	12441	7721	35	109
OBU	0	0	0	0
OCC	84841	5273	0	255
OCU	158441	10242	133694	8412
ORU	600000	834759	0	8270
Phillips	191886	21832	0	8193
Southern Nazarene	102989	148863	34792	2137
The University of Tulsa	705322	971051	24024	2888

TABLE P
COMPARATIVE COLLECTION SIZES FOR TWO- AND FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS BASED ON 1985 SURVEY DATA
(CONTINUED)

	Number of Books	Number of Microforms	Government Documents	Combined A-V
Two-Year Institutions - Public				
Carl Albert	16,868	13,541	0	1,177
Rogers State	23,530	18,611	0	1,972
Connors	28,447	68,795	0	1,972
Eastern OK State	39,826	322	0	4,320
El Reno	18,299	21,464	0	15,973
Murray	20,868	20,340	0	1,907
NEO	61,424	14,478	0	4,445
Northern Oklahoma	38,437	4,559	0	1,518
OK City Community	32,730	60,720	0	13,722
Rose State	75,697	18,571	0	6,755
Sayre	7,200	295	0	892
Tulsa Junior College	85,078	43,381	1,364	2,988
Western Oklahoma	37,655	2,216	0	2,435
Two-Year Institutions - Private				
OK Missionary Baptist	11,837	310	9,683	1,273
St. Gregory's	60,914	1,971	0	0
TOTAL FOR 2-YEAR INST.	585,371	332,366	11,047	68,757
TOTAL FOR 4-YEAR INST.	7,139,493	8,621,117	2,274,386	72,407
GROSS TOTAL	7,724,864	8,953,483	2,285,433	141,164

Clearly, Oklahoma community and junior colleges are implementing new learning technology in their Learning Resources Centers. It will be interesting to take note in future reports of the nature of the growth of such services as interactive instructional computer program authoring, electronic bulletin boards, commercial database services and computer-assisted instruction. Many Oklahoma institutions are already offering such services; others will likely follow. Though these services are of great benefit to students learning new skills in the 1980's, two-year institutions must commit themselves to solidly maintaining more traditional services at the same time. During periods of limited funding, it is possible that books and periodicals expenditures will have to be cut back in an effort to add computer-based information services for students who expect and require this type of access as part of their higher education.

Four-Year Institutions

The state's four-year institutions provide higher education to a diverse geography. The provision for higher education for citizens within moderate driving distance dictates a scattering of four-year schools, each requiring a basic core collection of academic library resources. Within their constrained budgets, the four-year institutions of the state, according to this year's survey data, continue to do well in the provision for library services. However, the collections of materials (i.e. the resources available) have not been sufficiently supported to keep pace with the changing information environment. As with last year's comprehensive study, the critical and core problem is the continuing failure of institutions to achieve the National Standards level of six percent of institutional E&G budgets (with audio-visual and special services funded over and above this six percent level). This continuing funding problem is doing irreparable harm to the quality of educational experience possible for Oklahoma higher education students. It is the responsibility

and mission of the university library to acquire and guarantee access to the knowledge and information of the years, and Oklahoma students simply do not have the informational resource base of other states whose institutions have achieved and maintained a higher percentage of the national standard.

Comprehensive Institutions

The state's comprehensive institutions are charged with the research and preservation collection responsibilities for the entire state. As the sites for the majority of the professional academic training and the academic research centers of the state, the need for an almost unlimited array of library resources is required by OU, OSU, and TU. Scholarship, research, and decision-making are only as good as the information they are based on. Obviously, the students of Oklahoma do not have the information opportunities of states whose research institutions place a greater emphasis on the development of quality library and information resources.

As with the two-year and four-year schools noted above, the comprehensive institutions do very well in provision for service within the funds provided. Usage levels of 50+ per student annually is notable. However, this represents use of materials available. As with four-year institutions, consistent and adequate institutional funding percentages can be a problem. Further, movement into newer technologies and automated systems is very expensive for research institutions because of the size and scope of their collections and these fiscal commitments should be made over and above regular funding bases.

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
State Capitol, Oklahoma City

LIBRARY STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Membership

Mrs. Beverly Jones
Chief Planning Officer
Oklahoma Department of Libraries
200 Northeast 18th Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Ms. Carol Hughes
Librarian
University Center at Tulsa
108 State Office Building
440 South Houston
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74127

Mr. Robert H. Patterson
Director of Libraries
and University Planning
The University of Tulsa
600 South College Avenue
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74104

Ms. Danelle Hall
Acting Director
Oklahoma City University
2501 North Blackwelder Avenue
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73106

Mr. Mike Rusk
Dean, Library and Learning Resources
Tulsa Junior College
6111 East Skelly Drive
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135

Mr. Jim Beavers
Head Librarian
Rose State College
6420 Southeast 15 Street
Midwest City, Oklahoma 73110

Mrs. Charlotte French
Director of Media Distribution
Oklahoma City Community College
7777 South May Avenue
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73159

Mr. Robert Phillips
Director of Library Services
Cameron University
Lawton, Oklahoma 73505

Dr. Ed Johnson
University Librarian
Oklahoma State University
Library, Room 204
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078

Dr. Richard Madaus
Dean, Library and Learning Resources
Northeastern State University
Tahlequah, Oklahoma 74464

Mr. John A. Walker
Librarian, Director
East Central University
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Mr. Sul Lee
Dean of University Libraries
University of Oklahoma
660 Parrington Oval
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Ms. Jeanette McQuitty
President
Oklahoma Chapter Association of
College and Research Libraries
202 East Seneca
Tahlequah, Oklahoma 74464

Appendix B

DATA ANALYSIS COMMENTS

This second year of the annual survey has permitted extensive refinement to the data collection and analysis techniques of this project.

This year a major move was made toward refining the survey instrument and analysis software into an "annual survey" format. Last year's survey contained a number of questions and sections which explored issues far beyond the needs of an annual review. Further, it was decided that comparison to national standards would be available in the software each year but would only be compiled and reported every five years. The next national standard comparison reporting is then scheduled for the 1990 survey.

Specific information relating to the construction of the tables is explored below:

1. E&G allocation data for public institutions was taken from the Regents' report, Oklahoma Higher Education LEADER, Vol. 1, No. 2, August 1985.

2. Per student allocations are a simple division of FTE reported students and total E&G budget.

3. Circulation estimates present the most complex calculations and include, for the first time, an index to measure the validity of the test week sample. The formula took the data from Question 1, Part VII on book check out by month. These data are considered by the investigators to be the most accurate and reliable, as it has traditionally been the longest kept measure of use in libraries. An index relationship between November and the entire year was established by dividing November (this year's test week month) by the sum of the year. This was done for each institution and ranged between .08 and .18; that is, that November last year ranged between 8% and 18% of the total book activity

for the year among reporting institutions. Then the test week total (for books checked out, Line 52) was similarly related to the previous year's November total, (i.e., how many of the test weeks would it take to become the full month of November for the previous year). This figure averaged between 3 and 5 but had extremes as high as 13.4. All values above 5 were declared invalid (There should not be more than 5 weeks possible in a month.) and blamed on a poor or inappropriate sample. The final calculation for each institution then amounted to multiplying the test week sample for each material type by the weekly index for each institution (a number between 3 and 5, which in effect converted the test week into a projected test month) and dividing this total by a decimal (a number between .08 and .18 for each institution, which in effect converted the test month to a test year based on the activity for the same month the previous year). The assumption underlying all calculations is that all formats will relate to the total year in the same manner as books checked out. While there is some degree for error in small numbers in the lesser used materials, on the whole, a reasonably accurate gross total should be expected from this technique.

4. Changes for next year's survey are expected to be minimal. It may be appropriate to further develop the accuracy of the circulation estimate by counting real data from the previous year in all material formats when available. This would reduce the total amount of estimation done and encourage comprehensive record-keeping at all institutions. This will be easier as more automated techniques for measuring activity become activated. Finally, a section on external finance will be added in the fiscal reporting to allow the reporting of non-E&G funding, federal programming, foundation funding, and other special projects. Several institutions have made extra efforts in these areas and reporting of all institutional library commitments should be made.

5. A copy of this year's survey instrument follows.

Appendix C

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
ANNUAL SURVEY OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
AND LEARNING RESOURCES CENTERS
FALL 1986

Each item should be completed by all institutions. Please return the completed survey to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Library Survey, 500 Education Building, State Capitol Complex, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

DUE DATE

November 7, 1986

Name and Mailing address of institution or campus covered by the report.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____
Name and Title of Respondent

_____
Telephone Number of Respondent (Area code, number, and extension)

Questions concerning this questionnaire should be directed to Dr. Larry Hayes, Vice-Chancellor for Educational Outreach, State Regents Office.

INSTITUTION _____

PART I-LIBRARY/LEARNING RESOURCES CENTER SERVICES AND POPULATION BEING SERVED

(Use October 1986 data in this section)

	FTE	HEADCOUNT	LINE NO.
Total number of students			(1)
Total number of teaching faculty			(2)
Total number of non-students with borrower privileges			(3)
Number of undergraduate degree programs			(4)
Number of graduate degree programs			(5)
Number of doctoral programs			(6)

Consider each of the catagories of services listed below. Please indicate by check mark if service is offered by your library. Count only services charged to library budget. Services checked here should also be reflected in Circulation and cost figures in Parts III, IV, and V.

Library

	Check mark	LINE NO.
Acquisitions and processing of printed materials		(7)
Circulation of printed materials		(8)
Bibliographic instruction, other than traditional reference service		(9)
Interlibrary loan		(10)
Commercial data base searching		(11)

INSTITUTION _____

	Check mark	LINE NO.
Acquisitions and processing of non-print materials		(12)
Circulation of non-print materials		(13)

Audio-Visual

Maintenance/repair of audiovisual equipment		(14)
Inventory control of audiovisual supplies and equipment		(15)
Graphic design and production (photography, graphic art work, transparencies, etc)		(16)
Closed-circuit television		(17)
Television production (equipment, staff, space)		(18)
Instructional technology (design of learning modules, scripting, etc.)		(19)
Centralized A-V equipment delivery		(20)

Special Services

Archives		(21)
Special collections (please list)		(22)

INSTITUTION _____

Special Services (continued)

	Check mark	LINE NO.
Copy Shop (other than self-service)		(23)
Learning Laboratories (language, computer, etc.)		(24)
TBTV Broadcast and/or receiving		(25)
Satellite communications (up and/or down link)		(26)
Radio or television stations		(27)
Testing, career counseling, and tutoring		(28)
Support services for cable and PBS televised instruction programs		(29)
Print shop		(30)
Special Services		(31)
Preservation Archives		(32)
Other (please list)		(33)

INSTITUTION_____

PART II-LIBRARY/LRC COLLECTIONS

CATEGORY	Added during past Year** (1)	Held at end of fiscal year (2)	LINE NO.
BOOKSTOCK (include government documents not in separate collections; include bound periodicals; exclude microforms) Number of Volumes			(34)
Number of Current Subscriptions			(35)
Separate Government Documents Collections - Number of Volumes			(36)
Reels of Microfilm			(37)
Number of physical units of all other types of microformats (microfiche, microcards, misc.)			(38)
16mm Film			(39)
Video Tape (Cataloged)			(40)
Audio Tape (Cataloged)			(41)
Phono Records (Cataloged)			(42)
Microcomputer Software (cataloged)			(43)
Compact Disk/Laser Disk Materials			(44)
Other: include all mixed media here			(45)
All Other Library Materials-Number of Titles (flat pictures, study print set, maps, charts, games, etc.)			(46)

**Gross number added: do not subtract the number withdrawn.

INSTITUTION_____

PART III-LIBRARY/LRC STAFF

Include contributed services staff. Exclude maintenance and custodial staff and students paid on an hourly basis.

Position	FTE Tenths Library (1)	FTE Tenths Audio Visual (2)	FTE Tenths Special Services (3)	LINE NO.
Library/LRC personnel whose duties are primarily administrative A. MLS				(47)
B. Non MLS				(48)
Professional librarians ALA accred. MLS				(49)
Other professional personnel on Library/LRC budget				(50)
Technical and clerical staff on Library/LRC budget				(51)
Total (sum of lines 47-51)				

INSTITUTION_____

PART IV-LOANS, USER CONTACTS & HOURS OF SERVICE

CATEGORY

CIRCULATION DESK COUNT

Please complete both columns

(List only items checked out to leave the premises.)	TEST WEEK OCT 6-12	Tot. Records Previous Year Count	LINE NO.
Circulating Book Collection			(52)
Periodicals			(53)
Reference books			(54)
Government documents			(55)
Microforms			(56)
Audio-Visuals			(57)
Other (please list)			(58)

IN HOUSE USE (INCLUDING TABLE COUNTS)

Circulating Book Collection			(59)
Periodicals			(60)
Reference Books			(61)

INSTITUTION_____

PART IV-LOANS, USER CONTACTS & HOURS OF SERVICE (CONTINUED)

Category	TEST WEEK Oct. 6-12	Tot. Records Previous Year Count	LINE NO.
Government Documents			(62)
Microforms			(63)
Audio-Visuals			(64)
Other (please list)			(65)
Microcomputer Software			(66)
Interlibrary Loan (Loaned to other libraries)			(67)
Interlibrary Loan (Borrowed from other libraries)			(68)
Commercial Database Searches			(69)
Reserve Circulation			(70)
Turnstile/Head Count			(71)
Total Reference Transactions			(72)

SPECIAL COUNTS

Audio Visual as defined in part one			(73)
Users served in 73			(74)
Special Services as defined in part one			(75)
Users served in 75			(76)

INSTITUTION_____

REFERENCE TRANSACTIONS, 1986

	COUNT	LINE NO.
Total group instruction sessions & tours, 1985-86		(77)
Total persons participating in group transactions reported on line no. 77		(78)

LIBRARY HOURS AND DAYS OF SERVICE

	Count	LINE NO.
Total hours open per week during fall school term		(79)
Total hours open staffed per week by professionals		(80)
Number of days open per week (5,6,7)		(81)

INSTITUTION_____

PART V-LIBRARY/LRC FINANCES

	Library*	Audio Visual**	Special Services**	LINE NO.
SALARIES AND WAGES				
Professional Salaries				(82)
Tech./Clerical Salaries				(83)
STUDENT WAGES				
A. Institutional				(84)
B. Federal Funds				(85)
MATERIALS				
A. Books				(86)
B. Periodicals (exclude microfilms)				(87)
C. Microforms				(88)
D. Binding and Rebinding				(89)
E. Commercial Bib. Databases Non OCLC)				(90)
F. Audio-Visual Materials				(91)
G. All other Library Materials				(92)
Automated Library Processing Costs (use charges, OCLC, other)				(93)
Preservation Projects				(94)
All other Library Operating Expenditures				(95)
Total				(96)
GRAND TOTAL				(97)

INSTITUTION_____

PART V-LIBRARY/LRC FINANCES (Continued)

	Library*	Audio Visual**	Special Services**	LINE NO.
OTHER FUNDS				
State				(98)
Federal				(99)
Private				(100)

*Library as defined in Part 1, page 2
**As defined in Part 1, page 3

PART VI-PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Please indicate amount to square footage committed to:		
1a. Square footage committed to materials collection		(101)
1b. Square footage committed to readers		(102)
1c. Square footage committed to library operations and administration		(103)
2. Total square footage for library as defined in Part I, Page 2		(104)
3. Seating capacity		(105)
4. Total space for Audio-Visual as categorized in Part I, Page 3		(106)
5. Total space for other as categorized in Part I, Page 3		(107)
6. (True/False) Fifty percent or more of student body lives on campus		(108)

INSTITUTION_____

PART VII-SPECIAL QUESTIONS

1. Please enter number of books only checked out through the Circulation desk for each month indicated:

July 85	_____	Nov 85	_____	March 86	_____
August 85	_____	Dec 85	_____	April 86	_____
Sept 85	_____	Jan 86	_____	May 86	_____
Oct 85	_____	Feb 86	_____	June 86	_____

2. (Private Institutions Only)
Please indicate your total institutional E & G budget. (See instructions for definition of E & G) $_____.

(State supported institutional data will be drawn from Regents reports.)

3. Centralized AV services (as defined in Part 1, page 3) are available on my campus. TRUE/FALSE (check one)

If true, they are (check one):
_____Included in Library/LRC Budget
_____In a separate budget
_____Both

In addition to centralized AV services on campus do individual academic departments have their own separate AV budgets?

Yes_____ No_____ Don't Know_____

INSTITUTION_____

PART VII-SPECIAL QUESTIONS (Continued)

4. (For Two Year Institutions Only)	Total Equipment Units	Approx. Uses per Year	LINE NO.
16mm Projectors			(109)
Super 8 Projectors			(110)
Video Cassette Players			(111)
Slide Projectors			(112)
Audio Cassette Players			(113)
Record Players			(114)